

The Reply

\$1.00 Yearly

September, 1913

10 Cents Copy

An
Anti-Suffrage
Magazine



Volume 1

Number 5

Entered as second-class matter July 22, 1913, at the Post Office at New Canaan, Conn., under
the Act of March 3, 1879

The Reply

Helen S. Harman-Brown, Editor and Publisher

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT NEW CANAAN, CONNECTICUT
ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO "THE REPLY," BOX 1526, NEW CANAAN, CONN.

PRINTED AT THE MAC-A-NAN PRESS, NEW CANAAN, CONN.

THE REPLY IS ON SALE AT BRENTANO'S, FIFTH AVENUE AND TWENTY-SEVENTH ST., NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Frontispiece—Mrs. Denison	
Editorial	97
Military Service and Its Relation to Women	By J. T. W. 100
Equality	By Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin 102
Are the Suffragists Honest	By Olive L. Reamy 105
The Denver Juvenile Court	108
Address to the Members of the House of Representatives	
	By Mrs. William Forse Scott 116
The Double Standard—A Parable of the Ages	By Upton Sinclair 118
Anti-Suffrage Organizations	119



As the financial support of a magazine comes largely from its success as an advertising medium, we trust that all who want to help the work which THE REPLY has undertaken, will not only read all its advertisements, but patronize its carefully selected advertisers

W O M A N AND THE REPUBLIC

A survey of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the United States and a
Discussion of the Claims and Arguments of its Foremost Advocates

By
Helen Kendrick Johnson
12 mo., 359 pages

Third Edition in Press

Price by mail, 30 Cents

Published by The Guidon Club, 3 W. 87th Street
New York City

"A dissertation full of social, political and moral scholarship, flanked on all sides by genuine common sense and the logic of evidence. It is a really valuable document."—Washington Times.

"Possibly there has been written a clearer, more impartial, more masterly work than this; but, if so, it has never been our good fortune to meet with it."—Denver Times.

"This book will hold the reader's attention from beginning to end."
—New York Commercial Advertiser.

"A book that deserves a very careful and thoughtful reading, especially by the women of this country."—Boston Home Journal.

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers



MRS C. H. DENISON

**A FORMER PRESIDENT OF SORORIS, AND EX-PRESIDENT AND HONARY PRESIDENT OF THE
GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS**

[Mrs. Denison has always been an advocate of the activities of women in the large field which modern conditions have opened to them, but she is opposed to Woman Suffrage]

The Reply

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

September, 1913

EDITORIAL

AN argument in favor of Woman Suffrage which is frequently heard by those of us who are opposing what we sincerely believe to be inexpedient, is that women have done so much to better conditions, that the advocate of giving them the ballot "feels" that they will use it better than the average man. In fact, it seems that women "feel with greater certainty the needs of women and have a clearer notion of what the State should do for women, and the other crying needs, that politicians will not heed, unless spurred by those who have been stirred in their hearts by cold facts." This statement of the case, written by one with an open mind, deserves the consideration of all who are constantly confronted with this point of view. As is invariably the case, the advocate of the Suffrage for women compares the work of the exceptional woman philanthropist, undoubtedly well equipped with money and with unlimited time at her disposal, with the average man. Now, the average man is not supplied with these qualifications, and his time is, as a rule, well employed

in trying to provide them for some woman to squander. Probably, if we thoroughly investigated conditions, with statistics for our basis, we would discover that the average man and woman are using all their powers for the struggle for existence. Therefore, as a basis for the argument of what women have done as a prophecy of what we "feel" they will do, it is hardly fair to take the exceptional woman. The exceptional woman is not the only woman to whom it is proposed to give the ballot. That because they feel the needs of other women, now unheeded by politicians, they need the vote (to turn them into politicians) seems to be disproved by what experience has shown us does exist—the fact that this class of women is doing, without the vote, as much as men with it. Not to be understood as disparaging what men are doing we refer now especially to the "uplift" of women for which Suffragists claim that men cannot feel the need. This appears to be the claim of the advocate of Suffrage, who is quoted above. The exceptional woman is already working for the best interests of the community

THE REPLY

and finds no difficulty in influencing legislation. A good bill introduced by a woman needs no vote to get it through the legislature. Why should it? It passes on its own merits. There need be no favor granted by the legislator. It costs nothing to pass a bill introduced by a non-partisan. Why then do we need the ballot? As a negotiable asset? The above contention is proved, on thoughtful consideration, if we look at the work done by such women as Jane Addams. Have many men with the ballot, done more for the good of humanity than this woman did, without it? Now that Miss Addams has become a partisan and a voter she has but the influence of "her" party behind her proposed legislation. Formerly, she had that of all the good men of all parties whenever she presented a good bill to the Illinois legislature.

FROM a leaflet circulated by the National American Woman Suffrage Association, under the heading, "Farmers' Wives, Consider This," we quote the following: "You want better laws for women—laws that will guarantee you the separate possession and sole control of your independent earnings and personal property, and that will make you guardian of your children, equally with their fathers." As this was sent into Connecticut doubtless for the consideration of the farmers' wives of that State, it is as well that those so importuned to "Meddle in Politics," as it further advises, should know that the present laws of Connecticut provide that a wife has absolute control of her separate property, if married since April 20, 1877, and that fathers and mothers are joint guardians of their children. These laws—man made—are quite

general throughout the United States, but in the leading Suffrage State—Colorado—no mention is made of any law securing the wife's control of her own property. The N. A. W. S. A. continues, therein, to address the farmers' wives, as follows: "Show the U. S. government that farmers' wives are themselves the best judges of how to improve their own lot and that they know how to do it by demanding votes for women." Connecticut women as well as men are conservative, and will doubtless "look before they leap" into the van of a cause that is so badly informed as to existing laws, and whose leaders credit equal ignorance to the women of this State.

AS SUFFRAGISTS lay such great stress upon the need of the vote to enable women to improve conditions, it is well that the public should realize what women are already doing without the vote. The following summary of the work done by the Woman's Municipal League of New York City is a practical illustration:

The purpose of the League is to promote among women an intelligent interest in municipal affairs, and to aid in securing permanent good government for Greater New York without regard for party or sectional lines.

The League was influential in passing the Employment Agency Bill, which has been copied in other States.

It was influential in securing matrons for the police stations.

It was instrumental in obtaining Chelsea Park.

It was instrumental in securing the restoration of the parks on upper Broadway, and is working for the improvement of the

grass plots on all parked streets.

It gives medals to the men of the street cleaning department.

It has revived the Waring Juvenile Citizen's Leagues.

It has erected thirty free iced water fountains.

It has placed a play director in Washington Square Park.

It has an industrial membership of 300 tenement dwellers and carried on for their benefit a recreation pier last summer.

It employs as field secretary a competent worker, who has served on Federal and State boards and commissions, and who thoroughly investigates any new piece of work undertaken by the League.

It administers a Home for Deficient and Delinquent Boys established by Mrs. Wm. K. Vanderbilt, Sr., at White Plains.

It issues a year book and three quarterlies, which keep members fully informed as to the activities of the organization.

It has a courts committee, which has been helpful in caring for and educating helpless victims.

It has a tenements committee, which investigates and has remedied many evils.

It has a parks and playgrounds committee, which endeavors to secure new playgrounds and have the parks better policed.

It has a streets committee, which was influential in stopping the smoking of automobiles, and has aroused the department of street cleaning to further activities.

It has a legislative committee, which examines and reports on bills affecting the welfare of Greater New York.

It has a sub-committee of the legislative committee, which attends hearings on ordinances of public importance.

It is earnestly urged that every woman in Greater New York join the Woman's Municipal League.

WHILE urging women of all classes to "Meddle in Politics" (N. A. W. S. A.), the appeals for relief for immediate needs—in many cases urgent—are met unmoved by Suffragists who have signed the pledge of "Will and Won't," an English importation, as follows:

"I hereby promise that

"I will give what I can and do my share of the work to gain votes for women.

"I will not give either money or services to any other cause until the women of —— State have been enfranchised.

"Signature —"



"The Antis Need Not Vote"

—But They Will

Does it seem reasonable to suppose that the exemption from responsibility so glibly granted to the Opposition by the Suffragists will be heeded? It is conceded by the National Woman Suffrage Association that but 8% of the women of America have expressed the desire to vote. The Opposition is becoming tired of being misrepresented by this insignificant number of their countrywomen. Do our legislators realize what power rests in the vote of 92% of the women plus the majority of men?



Denver's Policewoman Quits

Josephine Roche, Denver's first police-woman, resigned her position as inspector of amusements in the department of safety, Aug. 5, giving, as her reason, that even though she spends much time investigating and making arrests her cases are not prosecuted.

Military Service and Its Relation to Woman

By J. T. W.

AN intelligent woman of national reputation as a writer, was lately guilty of the following thoughtless remark which, as it is made so often in one form or another, requires a reply. She said: "In regard to woman's ability to enforce by arms the laws that she might desire to make, or the protection which she might wish to give to her country, I do not think that her inability would really count for much. The same thing might be said of a vast number of men who cannot—or at any rate do not—hold themselves in readiness to be soldiers." Now whether men can or do hold themselves in readiness to be soldiers is not the question, for if the occasion arises they will be drafted for service all the same. Furthermore there is a very great difference between a body of voters, all of whom may, except in the case of special excuse, be called on for service, and an equally large body of voters, none of whom may, under any circumstances be drafted. And so the ultimate answer to such an argument is that when volunteers run short, as is happening in many of the old countries today, conscription follows, and conscription can never be applied to women, even though Suffragists might form a volunteer corps.

In England today the topic of the hour is enforced national service. In France a bill has just been proposed and will undoubtedly be passed, which will require every mother's son to give three years' service to the Nation and the measure is

meeting with universal approval, except from Socialists, the popular demand being only that no exceptions shall be made. Why has it suddenly become necessary that every man in France should give three instead of two years' service to the State? The following quotation from a London paper answers that question:

"In Germany at present only a percentage of the able-bodied men who come of age each year are required to undergo military service, as with the larger German population and the higher German birth-rate there is a very large surplus of possible recruits over requirements. Moreover, in Germany men of education are called upon to serve only one year provided that they pass a severe examination. In France, with a much smaller population and a lower birth-rate, every able-bodied man has for some years been wanted for the army. The conscription yields annually about 224,000 men fit for service, but the number is slowly shrinking, and by 1920 it is calculated that it will be only 205,000."

In England there are one million more women than men, many of whom are without ties and unlikely to be called on to serve on the "battlefield of maternity." Do Suffragists believe such women should be drafted? If so, they know little of the training of soldiers, which during these three years "taxes men's physical powers to the limit of endurance." That Suffragists do not expect to be drafted is certain, but it might be well for them to realize

what the mothers of France are realizing today—that a falling birth-rate means an added burden to their sons and, in case of war, the complete annihilation of many families. Happily a new spirit of patriotism is sweeping over France and with the increased vitality due to the new faith, are coming earlier marriages and an increased birth-rate.

Our country, by reason of her great size, enviable position and untouched resources is still far from the problem that confronts France today. Nevertheless the indifference of our young men to national service both in the field and at the polls, reflects small credit on the civic training of American mothers. Suffragists say the only cure for this indifference is for women

to go to the battlefield and the polls. Anti-Suffragists answer that that would only encourage effeminacy and indifference in men and transpose masculine and feminine functions, to the detriment of both.

No one denies that the new spirit of sacrifice so apparent in France today emanates from the women who have trained the new generation to love their country and be willing, if need be, to die in her service. But who can tell how much of this again may not be in answer to the appeal of M. Etienne Lamy to the women of his country to show forth the spirit of Jeanne d'Arc and save France from Feminism?



Senate Did Not Report Senator Chamberlain's Motion

Editor Brooklyn Daily Eagle:

I should like to correct a statement made in the Suffrage notes in your columns of Wednesday, August 6. It is stated there that "the United States Senate has favorably reported Senator Chamberlain's resolution for amendment to the Constitution granting franchise to women."

The Woman Suffrage committee of the Senate—a "stacked" committee of Senators from equal Suffrage States, did report the amendment favorably to the Senate. The United States Senate does not report resolutions; it sometimes acts on them. There will be no action in the Senate or in the House on the Chamberlain resolution at the present extra session of Congress.

ALICE HILL CHITTENDEN.
President New York State Association
Opposed to Woman Suffrage.
New York, August 12, 1913.

Suffragette Heaven

This Suffragette idea isn't entirely new, anyhow.

Travellers who have penetrated the Himalaya mountains report a region ruled entirely by women. They are perfect Amazons, are responsible for such rude laws as are necessary, manage all the details of government, and have four or five husbands apiece.

Men perform all the rough tasks and menial labors and beyond that are of small account, although it is asserted that of late they are rebelling against their practical serfdom.

It occurs it would pay Great Britain to start excursions to the Himalayas one way only, no round trips, and make vacations for Suffragettes compulsory.—N. Y. Evening Telegram.



Equality

By Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin

“I W-A-N-T to be equal with men,” wailed Mrs. Cobden-Sanderson, the English Suffragette, in her address before the Chicago Woman’s Club, during her mission to this country, not once but many times.

But what reason has Mrs. Sanderson, or any other woman, to believe that the right to vote would make her, in any true sense, more nearly the equal of man than she is at present? Speaking for the sex as a whole, would it change for the better, her physical constitution, her mental processes, her spiritual capacities, or even the weight and worth of her influence in the mental or moral world? Would she be better fitted for the rough work of civilization; would her collective judgment of men and things be materially improved by the possession of the ballot? Would it make, or has it made any essential difference even in her power over legislation?

In the States where Woman Suffrage prevails, how many important offices have ever been held by women? In Colorado, during the first years after the ballot was obtained, a few women were elected to the legislature, but Louise Lee Hardin, then editor of the *Business Woman’s Magazine* at Denver, said editorially, that every year after women were allowed to vote, fewer places were allotted to them on party tickets, till at last there was not a woman in either house of the legislature. A well-known woman of Utah adds to this testimony that “the nomination of a woman to an elective office is now considered by all

parties as an element of weakness. It is no longer considered essential to recognize or cater to the woman vote at any convention by any political party.” “Women,” says Mrs. Hardin, and it must be remembered that she was a thorough Suffragist, and had voted more than once in the earnest faith that the ballot in the hands of women would be an elevating influence, “have only followed where men led. It is true that they have caused the passage of some petty measures, but it was only as a little sop to keep them in line for something which men had promised a great corporation that they would put through.”

Whatever good has been accomplished by women in any Suffrage State, has been gained by influence quite as much as by votes, and the sum of it has not been greater than that which has been achieved in other States by the old-fashioned way. In no State has the ballot brought to woman an equal power or influence to that exercised by men.

Is such false and specious equality as that, an equality founded on the mere dictum of law-makers without regard to the fundamental principles of power or character, a real improvement upon the present status of women?

Every rational human being is a social integer of a certain power and value. It may be roughly said to be like an industrial factor of so many horse-power, 20, 40, 60, or perhaps no more than 10, or even a minus quantity, but like a steam-engine it may be put to various uses. A stone-

crusher or a steam spinning-jenny may be of equal numerical power, yet they would be of far different qualities as industrial agents. One would be destructive, the other constructive. Or you might compare the electrical power which would shatter a mighty oak, with that which illuminates a vast auditorium. There might be a mechanical equality in the voltage employed in the two phenomena, but a very great disparity in the kind of benefit obtained. It is clear, therefore, that the true meaning of equality is not simple but complex; and we may safely argue that the voltage of power may be equal in men and women, while it is employed for very different purposes. Observation and reflection tend to show that the power of men in the intellectual and political world, is not greater than the power of woman in the social, moral and spiritual life; but it may be very seriously questioned whether an interchange of the purposes and methods of the two sexes would result in good to either, or to civilization at large.

For light upon the important subject of equality between men and women, let us look to nature as interpreted by the master minds of modern science.

In primordial protoplasm we find the nearest approach to equality which living matter affords, but the moment that the spirit of progress moves upon the face of matter what a stirring is there among the primal cells. New forms, new functions of less or greater value begin to appear. The creeping things, the flying things, those that swim in the water, those that burrow in the earth or roam upon it, begin to separate themselves from each other, and there is no longer even an apparent equality among them. There is no dictum

of biological science more universal nor more authoritative than that "Specialization of function is the first law of progress." Nature is extravagant to an almost incredible degree in the production of new forms, new species, new definitions. The thing she seems most to abhor is uniformity, sameness, equality. The fundamental idea of progress seems to express itself in change, unlikeness, variety of form and value.

But amid all these myriad variations from original conditions which seem at first view intended to be stable, one idea remains constant as the guiding, propelling force of evolution, and that is the principle of sex, the phenomena of parentage. It is the concensus of biologists of all schools that from sexual parentage all new variations from any established stock arise; that in the domain of fatherhood and motherhood whether of plants or animals, all upward steps in the path of progress are taken.

For proof of this statement, see not only the leading writers on biology, but such practical experimenters as Burbank and the professors in our agricultural schools. The better defined in any species are the differences of sex; the higher its rank in the scale of being the greater its chance for still further progress. The inequalities which spring from sex are the dynamic force of evolution. It is these inequalities which both Socialist and Suffragist are seeking to destroy.

The laws of nature are quiet but far-reaching in their action. Any fool may flaunt them in their faces with his foolish talk unrebuted, but when he invades their practical domain, attempts to carry his wild theories into action, he is likely to find himself in a stern grip which awakens

a lively fear that they ante-date and may outlive him.

As for instance, Mr. Jack London in his *War of the Classes*, in the chapter entitled "A New Law of Development," thus prophesies concerning the era of the common man:

"When the common man's day shall have arrived, the new social institutions of that day will prevent the weeding out of weakness and inefficiency. All, the weak and the strong will have an equal chance for procreation, and the progeny of all, of the weak as well as the strong, will have an equal chance for survival. This being so, if no new effective law of development be put into operation—then progress must cease. And not only progress (sic) for deterioration would at once set in.

It is a pregnant problem. What will be the nature of this new and most necessary law of development? Can the common man pause long enough from his undermining labors to answer? Since he is bent upon reconstructing society, can it be so reconstructed that a premium in some unguessed way will still be laid upon the strong and efficient, so that the human race will continue to develop? Can the common man, or the uncommon men who are allied with him, devise such a law, and when devised put it into execution?"

A Socialist of larger caliber than Mr. Jack London could hardly have stated the case more clearly, but being a protagonist, he would probably have taken counsel of his better judgment and not have stated it at all.



Hurls Names at Suffrage

Headquarters of the National American Woman Suffrage Association at Washington, D. C., seethed with indignation on July 28, when officers and members learned that Representative J. Thomas Heflin, of Alabama, their bitterest opponent in Congress, had fired another broadside into their camp from the pulpit of a local church. In addition to criticising the "cause" in vigorous terms, Mr. Heflin also gave these definitions of Suffragettes and their male supporters:

"Suffragettes—Unmarried female fanatics.

"Suffragettars—Unhappy, discontented married women.

"Suffragettors—Male Suffragettea. Feeble-minded, suffrotescent creatures."

Mr. Heflin explained that the word "suffrotescent" was his own coinage.

After some thought he said he believed that "wooden-headed" could be substituted for it without any loss in meaning.
—Exchange.



Women Jury Convicts Her

Irregularities were waived with all the finality of a woman's "because" when the first jury of women ever chosen in Illinois tried and convicted another woman in Justice George Ziegelmeyer's court at East St. Louis, July 29. Mrs. Blanche Thomas was charged with disturbing the peace of her neighbor, Mrs. Edward McKinney, was found guilty and fined \$5 and costs.

Four of the women jurors, it developed, were under age, and another lived in an adjoining county, but attorneys for both the prosecution and the defense agreed to accept them nevertheless.—N. Y. Times.

Are the Suffragists Honest?

By Olive L. Reamy

THE search for an honest man is no longer conducted by the aid of a lantern; it is done with the assistance of all the sunlight that can be let in, for honesty has become a faddist cry. Are our food-stuffs honest in quality? Are our weights and measures honest? Are our officials honest? These are the questions actuating the numerous investigating committees and the various leagues formed for concerted defense against trickery in trade.

Let us put the question to the Suffrage agitators and see how they stand the test.

One of the leading Suffrage papers published recently a long and boastful account of the achievement of Woman Suffrage in procuring, by the favor of the women, the enactment, in a certain State, of the so-called Red Light Injunction and Abatement Act. It was heralded as a great victory for the women, a law made possible only by their influence as voters. On another page, in a brief and inconspicuous paragraph, was announced the passage of a similar bill in a manhood Suffrage State. Were the votes of women necessary, after all? Was the Suffrage paper honest?

In a flight of womanish oratory on Suffrage, a speaker gave as the cause of the easy victory of Woman Suffrage in Colorado that the men of that State would refuse nothing to the noble army of pioneer women who had so bravely met the dangers and endured the privations of frontier life. If those appreciative men

would refuse women nothing they asked for, why was it necessary for the women to burden themselves with a new task when they might have taken the easier way of merely suggesting desired laws from time to time and letting the men have the pleasure of granting requests? Was the speaker honest in her statement of the matter? Did she not know that Suffrage in that State is a relict of the defunct and now discredited Populist party?

The Suffragists in general declare themselves opposed to war and maintain, as one of the bulwarks of their cause, that force in government is no longer necessary; and yet women in England are committing most destructive acts in the cowardly manner of savages, to prove, presumably, their love of peace, while the safety of human life and property is hardly assured by the large police force of the country. Are the Suffragists honest in their naive assertion that "they will vote to abolish war?"

The cry is raised that "taxation without representation is tyranny." The father of one of the most conspicuous Suffrage agitators has recently died, and the papers enumerate among the items of his estate, "property in nearly every State in the union." He could vote in only one State. He must therefore have been the victim of a nearly forty-seven-fold tyranny. Are the Suffragists not aware of this penalty paid by riches? If not, they can hardly qualify as intelligent voters.

THE REPLY

Another Suffrage demand is for the ballot as a protection to women, the particular form of protection being unspecified. When an effort was made in Colorado to save girls from temptation by making it unlawful for them to be served with liquor in public resorts, the feminist leaders declared hotly against any sex discrimination before the law. Where was the honesty?

We have our sympathies aroused by talk about the eight million women workers in the land and the immorality induced by scanty wages, and yet a large percentage of these workers are employed as domestic help and the Suffragists admit that the largest number of immoral women comes from this class. May not housekeepers pay more to their cooks if they choose? And can they not make living conditions attractive enough and surrounding influences sweet enough to hold the young girls in their charge in the path of virtue? Could they not accomplish much by giving their help more than a choice between the kitchen and the streets in which to receive company? Is Suffrage honest in maintaining that the votes of such women will control the social evil?

Suffrage writers hold forth the advantages accruing to women through "economic independence." Do they really believe that the majority of mothers would be happier to go out and earn their own, if not their children's, bread and butter and leave their homes in the care of cheap help? Is there more satisfaction and honor in working for wages than in working for one's own loved ones? Isn't the old-fashioned division of labor between husband and wife the natural and logical division established by the best interests of offspring?

The Suffragists say that exercising the franchise will educate women and take them from their narrow orbit. In another breath they say, "Look at the kind of men who vote! Am I not as good as they?" And yet those scornfully cited men have had the ballot for years. Have they been educated by it? And is there any proof of individual women in equal franchise States having been improved by voting? They talk about politics instead of their children, we are told, but is the transference of interest necessarily a benefit to the family?

We are vehemently assured, if we happen to favor temperance, that women voters would abolish the saloon. Have they done it when given the opportunity?

The Suffragists assert that the ballot is the direct road to legislation. Are they making use of the ballot to win their cause? Are they not rather deserting the slow process of winning the approval of their own sex and concentrating their efforts on legislative bodies, because that is the easier and more effectual way. How about honesty here?

An ardent Suffragist complained bitterly because the wishes of the majority of the community had not been considered in the appointment of a certain inspector. She had no defense when asked why she was willing to have the wishes of a majority of the women of the land disregarded if only her small, but vociferous, party might win.

One prominent upholder of the Suffrage cause writes that her mother was made a Suffragist by feeling the ignominy of having to sit in her carriage while her negro coachman exercised the prerogative of manhood. The inference is that she coveted the privilege of going into the polling place in company with her coachman,

which would have been a questionable pleasure in the opinion of some. Of course, in Suffrage States husbands and wives are supposed to go to the polls together, but is there any law to forbid the coachman and all the maids walking in beside them? Narrowed down, it becomes a question of sitting in the carriage or going in with the scorned class. Which would be preferable, taking nothing else into consideration? Is that an honest reason for advocating Woman Suffrage?

The following from the letter of a California woman to a Suffrage paper is evidently honest and it accords with the knowledge already possessed by the women who are wise enough to oppose enfranchisement because they see in it more than its fanatical advocates are apparently able to discern until too late. The writer says: "They (the Suffragists) very soon discovered that right and wrong in law-making is not the simple thing it seems in books or from the outside; that issues apparently simple are related and interrelated in a most puzzling way."

We should rejoice that California women are honest enough to admit their own pre-Suffrage ignorance. Would that others might profit by their experience!



Women's Instructions

On August 5 eight of Chicago's newly appointed policewomen took the oath of office with upraised hands in the office of the secretary of police, and after having the regulation police stars pinned upon the lapels of their tailormade jackets, they dispersed to the stations to which they were assigned. Two of the women appointed by Mayor Harrison failed to appear, but will go on duty later.

Mrs. Alice Clements, Miss Lulu Parks, Mrs. Margaret F. Butler, Mrs. Madge Wilson, Mrs. F. Woodman-Willsey, Miss Clara Olsen, Mrs. Anna Loucks and Miss Emma Nukom were the ones who appeared in Chief McWeeny's office at 10 o'clock in the morning and received two hours' instructions.

The chief delivered a long list of "Don'ts" to be observed by the new minions of the law. Some of them were:

- "Don't stretch the truth.
- "Don't be too strenuous, have compassion.
- "Present all cases fairly and squarely.
- "Don't be nosey.
- "Don't complain about long hours.
- "Don't use too much force in making arrests.
- "Don't talk more than necessary; let your commanding officer do most of the talking."

Presumably these "Don'ts" are not delivered to the men of the force, or they would not be considered worthy of publication. How strange that the "Purifiers of Politics" should have "truth" and "compassion" as their first lesson from Brutal Man!

"Readers of the Woman's Page are invited to express their opinions on questions of the day in these columns.

"Malicious, libelous or improper communications will not be printed.

"Write on one side of the paper only, sign your name legibly, and limit your communication to 800 words."

These instructions clipped from a newspaper of high standing, strike us as unfamiliar, in making requests of the same kind from men.

The Denver Juvenile Court

THE LITERARY DIGEST of August 2 has this to say of the activity of the Woman's Protective League of Denver: "Dr. Mary Elizabeth Bates, a leader of the Denver Anti-Woman Suffrage organization, is leading the latest fight against Judge Lindsey, on the ground that he has shown too much mercy to men accused of committing offenses against girls. She is assisted in her campaign by other members of the W. P. L. and by G K. Whitehead." As it is reported from Denver that both Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists are in favor of the recall of Judge Lindsey, it is as well that the ground of this complaint should be understood by Eastern men and women. To that end the following remarks and the records of the Denver county jail are published:

Remarks on the Record of the Juvenile Court

The following statistics have been taken from a copy of the records of the Denver county jail, certified to by affidavit. A copy may be obtained by applying to the Woman's Protective League.

While the certified copy goes back only to March, 1909, it is of a piece with the records of the Juvenile Court from its beginning, twelve years ago.

It shows that in the Denver Juvenile Court girl children are not protected, but their despoilers are. It shows that anyone who enjoys the pastime of destroying the souls and bodies of girl children may do so in almost perfect safety under the protection of the Denver Juvenile Court.

It shows why immorality among young men and girls is increasing with startling rapidity in Denver, why disease is spreading into otherwise secure homes, and why the average age of mothers of illegitimate children is yearly growing younger.

We all know how ravishers are dealt with in other States—it is by the rope, the bullet and the stake.

We know how the women of San Francisco recalled the judge who merely reduced the bond of a man charged with assault to rape a young girl from \$3,000 to \$1,000, a judicial act of insignificance in comparison with the usual habit of years of the Denver Juvenile Court.

Probably in no other community could such conditions as those which exist in the Denver Juvenile Court be perpetuated from year to year and tolerated. No other judge would be permitted such license.

When men are asked to do something to put an end to these abuses of law and decency by the judge of the Denver Juvenile Court, they say, "You women put him where he is and keep him there. It is a Suffrage State. When you women want it stopped you can stop it. We are very willing to help you correct this mistake and remedy the consequences, but you must take the lead yourselves."

And it is true, is it not? The women have been ever the fanatic champions of the Juvenile judge and have repeatedly elected him by their efforts, as he and they have boasted throughout the world.

What will the women, and the men too, of America and of the world think when

they learn that the women of Denver supinely permit these outrages upon defenseless womanhood and childhood to go on, not once, but by scores, committed with full understanding and intention, continued year in and year out by this judge whose moral honor and judicial wisdom and integrity they have thus guaranteed?

What excuse can the Denver women offer? They should have known, should they not? What is the use of deplored the growth of "White Slavery" and of legislating against it when we permit these laws against it to be nullified by the judge of the Juvenile Court, and little "White Slaves" to be manufactured month by month by their despoilers? Whose boys are safe? Whose girls are safe?

We are not publishing these facts in the newspapers to the scandal and disgrace of Denver, but we are appealing directly to you in the hope that you will care enough to help put an end to such conditions.

The wrong that has been done cannot

be undone, but this record has been sent to you so that you may have definite data, which, whatever, your impressions or attitude may have been, you probably have not had; in order that you may know the infamy which has been carried on under the banner of Suffrage and in the name of justice and protection to little children by this judge of the Denver Juvenile Court, to whom all honor, trust and support have been so freely given, and in order also, to enlist your active co-operation to wipe away this stain, this shame to Denver womanhood, this wanton destruction of innocent young girls and little children.

There is but one way to do this. Will you help? If you will help, join the Woman's Protective League, organized for this purpose. Sign the enclosed card and return it with your contribution.

Do not their responsibilities, their opportunities, their self-respect and their standing before Almighty God demand this of Denver women now?



THE REPLY

Record of the County Jail of the City and County of Denver of the Prisoners Received from the Juvenile Court

Fol. No.	DEFENDANT	AGE	CHARGE	JUDGE	SENTENCE	RECEIVED	DISCHARGED	REMARKS
55	George Neibert -----	42	As. to Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 29 1909	Nov. 2 1909	"	Bonds Lindsey
55	Leon Cassidy -----	22	Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 30	"	Sept. 30	"
55	Frank Sullivan -----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 30	"	Jan. 11 1910	Bonds Lindsey
56	Charles G. Swain -----	22	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 2	"	Oct. 7 1909	Re Book 58
58	Charles G. Swain -----	22	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 7	"	"	Canon City
61	Harry Hudson -----	45	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 7	"	Oct. 13	"
65	Eddie Butler (col'd)	26	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 30	"	Oct. 30	"
60	Tom Kinsella -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 15	"	Dec. 10	Discharged Lindsey
66	James McKlee -----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 19	"	Nov. 19	"
71	Ed Davis -----	32	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 19	"	Nov. 20	"
74	Dane Bert -----	17	Rape	Lindsey	Dec. 11	"	Jan. 21 1910	Discharged Lindsey
76	Harry Nicol -----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Dec. 29	"	Dec. 30 1909	Buena Vista
76	Harry Albertson -----	19	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 4	"	Jan. 5 1910	Bonds Lindsey
77	Henry Bellman -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 5	"	"	Bonds Lindsey
77	Lewin VonFuller -----	17	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 11	"	Jan. 12 1910	Discharged Lindsey
78	Harry Bellman -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 7	"	"	Re Book 78
82	Robert Zink -----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 12	"	"	See page 77 for des.
82	Robert Zink -----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 26	"	Jan. 22	Discharged Lindsey
66	Dan Burt -----	17	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 29	"	Jan. 20	"
83	Harry Davis -----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 9 1909	"	"	See page 77 for des.
86	Charles LaCrosse -----	26	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 31 1910	"	"	Re Book page 74
87	James Bridgeman -----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Feb. 11	"	"	Re Book page 95
88	Richard Rowley -----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Feb. 18	"	"	Discharged Lindsey
89	Louis Young -----	19	Rape	Lindsey	Feb. 23	"	"	Bonds Lindsey
93	Louis Youngs -----	19	Rape	Class	Feb. 25	"	"	Bonds Lindsey
94	Carl Gobach -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	March 18	"	"	Bonds Class
94	Louis Youngs -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	March 18	"	"	See page 89 for des.
95	Harry Davis -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	March 23	"	"	Re Book page 94
95	H. A. McDonough -----	28	Rape	Lindsey	March 25	"	"	See page 93 for des. B.V.
95	Earl Headley -----	25	Rape	Lindsey	March 25	"	"	See page 93 for des. B.V.
98	Elmer Bledsoe -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	April 2	"	"	See page 83 for des.
98	Elmer Bledsoe -----	16	Rape	Class	April 5	"	"	Time ex. Disch. Lindsey
107	Earl Headley -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	May 11	"	"	Re Book page 107
108	Raym'd J. Voorhees -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	May 19	"	"	Bonds Lindsey
109	Ed Davis -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	May 31	"	"	See page 71 for des.
110	Ed Davis -----	16	Rape	Lindsey	June 9	"	"	Re Book 110
								See page 71 for des. B.V.

For notations, abbreviations, affidavit A see Page 114

Record of the County Jail of the City and County of Denver of the Prisoners Received from the Juvenile Court

Fel. No.	DEFENDANT	AGE	CHARGE	JUDGE	SENTENCE	RECEIVED	DISCHARGED	REMARKS
112	Earl Hyde	19	Rape	Lindsey	June 17	1910	June 22	1910
127	Stanley Glasssey	20	Rape	"	August 30	"	Sept 17	"
127	Robert Hester	27	Rape	"	August 30	"	Sept 17	"
129	Zanders Alt	28	Rape	"	Sept 16	"	Sept 17	"
130	Walter Gregg	16	Rape	"	Sept 21	"	Sept 26	"
130	E. Slocomb (st/k'm'n	16	Rape	"	Sept 21	"	Sept 26	"
131	Clyde Caldwell	16	Rape	"	Sept 27	"	Oct 1	"
132	Clyde Caldwell	16	Rape	B. V.	Oct 1	"	Oct 9	"
13	Wm. E. Windsor	26	Rape	"	Nov 22	"	Nov 22	"
13	Fred Mellett	17	Rape	"	Nov 30	"	Nov 28	"
141	Joseph Popish	21	Rape	"	Dec 19	"	Dec 20	"
146	James Conway	27	At. to Rape	"	Jan 9	"	1911	Bonds Lindsey
151	W. E. Windsor	20	Rape	"	Jan 26	"	Feb 3	P 137 for des. Dis Lindsey
152	Joes. Popish	18	Rape	"	Jan 30	"	Feb 7	P 14.1 for des. Dis Lindsey
154	Charles Roessler	18	Rape	"	Feb 9	"	Feb 10	Discharged Lindsey
170	Lee Brickens	20	Rape	Class Lindsey	April 14	"	April 28	Discharged Lindsey
174	James Lane (col'd)	16	Rape	"	May 6	"	June 1	P 149 for des. Re Bk 180 p
174	Frank Antonelli	21	Rape	"	May 8	"	May 11	Bonds Lindsey
181	Bert Syas	27	Rape	"	June 16	"	June 17	Re Book page 182
182	Bert Syas	27	Rape	"	June 17	"	June 18	See page 181 for des.
185	no. Omelian	43	Rape	"	July 3	"	Trans. to Vol 3, page 1	Trans. to Vol 3, page 1
187	as. Clay Noecker	As. to Rape	"	"	July 13	"	July 18	Trans. to Vol 3, page 2
188	Al. Nabo	23	Rape	"	July 18	"	July 18	Trans. to Vol 3, page 2
188	Joe Navares	23	Rape	"	August 2	"	August 5	Trans. to Vol 3, page 2
192	no. Webb	35	As. to Rape	"	August 5	"	August 26	Re Book see page 196
192	as. Williams (col'd)	23	Rape	"	August 26	"	August 30	See page 192 for des. C.C.
196	Jas. Williams	23	Rape	"	"	"	"	"
Vol. 3								
1	John Omelian	48	Rape		July 3	"	Oct 6	"
2	J. Clay Noecker	30	As. to Rape		July 13	"	July 15	"
2	Al. Nabo	23	Rape		July 18	"	Sept 12	"
2	Joe Navarro	23	Rape		August 1	"	Sept 12	"
2	John Webb	35	A. to R.		Sept 13	"	Sept 20	Discharged Lindsey
8	Al. Nabo	23	Rape	B. V.	Sept 13	"	Sept 17	B.V. Re Book from page 2
8	Joe Navaro	23	Rape	B. V.	Sept 13	"	Sept 17	B.V. Re Book from page 2
16	Louis Gump	18	Rape		Nov 6	"	Feb 10	Released on own recogniz.
18	Claude Mitchum	22	Rape		Nov 16	"	Nov 16	1912 Released Lindsey
19	Mike Papo	21	Rape		Nov 21	"	Dec 1	Released Lindsey
22	Geo. Holmes (col'd)	17	Rape		Dec 9	"	Dec 11	Released Lindsey
24	Abraham Schwartz	20	Rape		Dec 18	"	Dec 20	Discharged by Lindsey
24	Ralph McGowan	18	Rape		Dec 18	"	Dec 23	Discharged by Lindsey
39	LeR. L. Farnsworth	50	Witt.		Feb 21	"	Feb 21	Canon City
90	Edward Fitzgerald	26	Bastardy		Jan 4	"	Jan 18	1913 Disch. See P. 32 for des.

For notations, abbreviations, affidavit □ see Page 114

THE REPLY

Record of the County Jail of the City and County of Denver of the Prisoners Received from the Juvenile Court

Fol. No.	DEFENDANT	AGE	CHARGE	JUDGE	SENTENCE	RECEIVED	DISCHARGED	REMARKS
24	Russell Croft-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Dec. 18	1911	Dec. 23	Discharged Lindsey
31	Thos. Kinsella-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 19	1912	Mar. 16	Discharged Lindsey
31	Charles Robinson-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	"	"	Feb. 28	Released Lindsey
34	H. Gregory-----	24	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 29	"	Feb. 4	C. Hospital, Dr. McGilvray
37	H. Gregory-----	24	Rape	Lindsey	Feb. 7	"	Feb. 27	See page 34, for des.
37	Peter Anderson-----	52	Rape	Lindsey	Feb. 8	"	Feb. 23	Returned from hospital
43	Wm. Schell-----	24	Rape	Lindsey	Mar. 8	"	April 12	Bonds Lindsey
46	Lewis (Sally) Williams (colored)-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Mar. 29	"	June 6	Released order of court
50	Herman Stember-----	20	Rape	Lindsey	April 13	"	May 7	Discharged Lindsey
50	Edward Darnell-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	April 13	"	May 7	"
50	Howard Bivens-----	17	Rape	Lindsey	April 13	"	May 7	"
50	Chester Hobart-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	April 13	"	May 7	"
50	Frank Shelton-----	20	Rape	Lindsey	April 13	"	May 7	"
50	Geo. Stiles-----	17	Rape	Lindsey	April 15	"	May 7	"
56	Sam Sulis-----	17	Rape	Lindsey	June 10	"	June 11	"
58	Joe Mazzanis-----	20	Rape	Lindsey	June 21	"	Sept. 17	Buena Vista
61	Ed. Brown-----	23	Rape	Lindsey	July 2	"	July 2	Bonds Dixon
62	Mark Daniels-----	20	Rape	Lindsey	July 8	"	July 9	"
62	Clarace Mathews-----	19	Rape	Lindsey	July 8	"	July 16	Rel. on own recognizance
62	Geo. Miller-----	39	Rape	Lindsey	July 9	"	July 29	Bonds Lindsey
70	Harry Bernstein-----	19	Rape	Lindsey	August 26	"	August 27	Bonds Lindsey
72	Thomas Kinsella-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 6	"	Sept. 20	See page 31. Buena Vista
72	Lesle Adams-----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 6	"	Sept. 11	Re Book below
72	Claude Newhouse-----	22	Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 6	"	Sept. 9	Arapahoe County
72	Morgan Jackson-----	26	Rape	Lindsey	Sept. 11	"	Sept. 11	Bonds Lindsey
76	W.G. Weems-----	20	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 7	"	Nov. 19	Discharged
76	C. F. Weems-----	17	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 7	"	Nov. 19	"
80	Jess R. Bryan-----	21	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 4	"	Dec. 3	"
81	Jesse Bryan-----	Rape	Lindsey	Oct. 15	"	Dec. 3	See page 80	
83	Louis Whitsell-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 29	"	Nov. 29	Bonds Lindsey
84	Roscoe Earl-----	17	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 29	"	Dec. 9	"
84	Ulyssis Anderson-----	15	Rape	Lindsey	Nov. 29	"	Nov. 30	Bonds Lindsey
92	Tony Rossi-----	27	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 11	1913	Jan. 24	Re Booked on page 90
93	Geo. Davis-----	19	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 16	"	Mar. 10	See page 92. (This man is held on charge of rape)
97	Frank Gregory-----	19	Rape	Lindsey	Jan. 25	"	Feb. 2	Discharged Lindsey
100	Ryan Emmett-----	19	Rape	Lindsey	Feb. 1	"	Feb. 11	"
51	Dale Rhodes-----	22	Rape	Lindsey	April 27	1912	May 25	Discharged Lindsey
51	Don Kinney-----	19	Rape	Lindsey	April 27	"	May 25	"
51	Harold Caldwell-----	18	Rape	Lindsey	April 27	"	May 25	Discharged Lindsey

For notations, abbreviations, affidavit () see Page 114

Record of the County Jail of the City and County of Denver of the Prisoners Received from the Juvenile Court

Fel. No.	DEFENDANT	AGE	CHARGE	JUDGE	SENTENCE	RECEIVED	DISCHARGED	REMARKS
45	Albert Patterson	19	Ind. Lib.	Class Lindsey	10 years to life	July 29 1903	August 6 1903	Nolle Pross.
94	Earl Leonard	23	Sodomy	"	March 19 1910	March 22 1910	Re Book page 95	
95	Earl Leonard	23	Sodomy	"	March 22 "	"	See page 94 for des.	C. C.
100	Jno. Dobin	19	Ind. Lib.	"	April 15 "	"	Re Book page 109	
109	Jno. W. Land	51	"	"	May 27 "	"	Bonds Lindsey	
109	Jno. Dobin	19	"	"	May 31 "	"	See page 100 for des.	
111	Dick Simmons	16	"	"	June 15 "	"	June 21 "	Time ex.
117	Chas. Kitzler	19	"	"	July 11 "	"	July 16 "	Discharged Lindsey
118	Chas. Kitzler	19	"	"	July 16 "	"	July 22 "	Re Book page 118
134	Wm. Rhodes	34	"	"	Oct. 22 "	"	Oct. 24 "	See page 117 for des. B.V.
135	Wm. Rhodes	"	"	"	Nov 2 "	"	Nov 4 "	Bonds Lindsey
152	Jno. Farmer	44	"	"	Jan 31 1911	April 1 1911	June 3 "	Released Lindsey
166	Walter B. Evans	20	Sodomy	30 days C. C.	March 31	"	"	Re Book page 167
167	Walter B. Evans	20	Ind. Lib.	April 1 "	"	"	"	Re Book page 180
174	Walter B. Evans	20	Sodomy	May 4 "	"	"	"	See page 152 for des.
174	Walter B. Evans	20	Ind. Lib.	June 4 "	"	"	"	Bonds Whitford
180	Harry Meinke	54	Sodomy	June 6 "	"	"	"	See page 166 for des. C. C.
180	Walter B. Evans	20	Sodomy	July 8 "	"	"	"	Bonds Lindsey
185	Geo. Teneg	72	T. I. Lib.	July 10 "	"	"	"	Trans. to Vol. 3, page 2
186	Frank Moore	38	Ind. Lib.	July 10 "	"	"	"	Bonds Lindsey
186	Frank Letorre	41	"	"	"	"	"	
Vol. 3	Frank Moore	38	"	"	July 10	"	July 20 "	Discharged Lindsey
12	Daniel F. Sullivan	24	"	"	Oct. 7 "	"	Oct 7 "	Bonds Lindsey
13	G. A. Griffith	72	"	"	Oct. 13 "	"	Oct 18 "	Discharged Lindsey
					1 year or till further order of court			
27	S. S. Swanson	45	"	C. C. 2 to 5 years	Jan 2 1912	Feb 5 1912	1912	Re Book page 37
31	Earl Hoffman	30	"	Shattuck	Jan 19	"	"	Re Book page 50
37	S. S. Swanson	"	"	6 to 20 years	Feb 5	"	"	C. C. 2 to 5 yrs. Shattuck
				Canon City				See page 27 for des.
39	Chas. Gray (col'd)	55	"		Feb 19	"	April 11 "	Discharged Lindsey
46	Henry Jackson, col'd	36	"		March 28	"	March 29 "	See page 18 Re Book below
46	Henry Jackson	"	"		March 29	"	April 8 "	See above Re Book 49
55	Albert Williams	24	"		June 9	"	Sept 26 "	Held \$1500 bond C. J. D.
64	Pat (Chink) Hickey	56	"		July 17	"	Sept 27 "	Discharged Lindsey
64	Harry Hyatt	35	"		July 17	"	Sept 29 "	Canon City
73	Jacob Gatwood	66	"		Sept 18	"	Nov 19 "	Canon City

For notations, abbreviations, affidavit □ see Page 114

THE REPLY

THE REPLY

Affidavit A, notations, etc.

State of Colorado } ss
City and County of Denver }

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript as to the items stated from the records of the County Jail in the City and County of Denver of all the cases received from the Juvenile Court in said City and County of the classes indicated between the first and last dates hereon.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this eighth day of May, A. D. 1913.

My commission expires March 8, 1915.

CHARLES H. BRYAN, Notary Public.

Affidavit B, notations, etc.

State of Colorado } ss
City and County of Denver }

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript as to the items stated from the records of the County Jail in the City and County of Denver of all the cases received from the Juvenile Court in said City and County of the classes indicated between the first and last dates hereon.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this eighth day of May, A. D. 1913.

My commission expires March 8, 1915.

CHARLES H. BRYAN, Notary Public.

8 Vol. 3 Al. Nabo never arrived in Buena Vista.

182 Bert Syas, sentence 5 to 70 years.
Incest.

39 Vol. 3. LeRoy L. Farnsworth. See page 36, Feb. 4, John Martin (Farnsworth) Rape. Dist. Court. 10 to 20 years Canon City.

C. C. stands for Canon City, B. V. for Buena Vista, where the penitentiary and reformatory are respectively located.

*Turned over to Sheriff Heater.

On page 39, Vol. 3. LeRoy L. Farns-

worth was brought from Canon City as a witness, therefore this case belongs in the miscellaneous cases and not in the rape list.

On page 90, Vol. 3. Edward Fitzgerald, bastary, belongs in the miscellaneous cases and not in the rape list.

Affidavit C, notations, etc.

State of Colorado } ss
City and County of Denver }

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript as to the items stated from the records of the County Jail in the City and County of Denver of all the cases received from the Juvenile Court in said City and County of the classes indicated between the first and last dates hereon.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this eighth day of May, A. D. 1913.

My commission expires March 8, 1915.

CHARLES H. BRYAN, Notary Public.

†Released by order of court.

Summary of rape cases: Total 86
Sentences, 16

4 to penitentiary	
10 to reformatory	
1 fined \$25 and costs	
1 given 10 days in jail	
No sentences	68
To another court	2

Affidavit D, notations, etc.

State of Colorado } ss
City and County of Denver }

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript as to the items stated from the records of the County Jail in the City and County of Denver of all the cases received from the Juvenile Court in said City and County of the classes indicated between the first and last dates hereon.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and notarial seal this eighth day of May, A. D. 1913.

My commission expires March 8, 1915.

CHARLES H. BRYAN, Notary Public.

13 Vol. 3. G. A. Griffith. "Further order of court," was discharged 5 days later.

73 Vol. 3. Jacob Gatwood, sentence suspended on condition he go to live with daughter in Kansas.

37 S. S. Swanson, sodomy.



Guidon Club Objects to Hearing by Suffrage Representatives

The Guidon Club, the only national organization composed of both men and women opposing Woman Suffrage, adopted the following resolution at a special meeting of its legislative committee on Aug. 12:

"We as Anti-Suffragists have no objection to the creation of another Woman Suffrage committee in Congress; we are willing to present our side of the contention before any fair committee; but we earnestly protest against having the personnel of the new House committee made up entirely of Representatives favorable to Woman Suffrage, as is the case with the present Senate committee.

"We deem it only fair to ask that no Representative from a Woman Suffrage State shall be allowed a place on the House committee, since the proposed Federal amendment cannot affect those States; whereas it is of the utmost concern to the States which have not yet adopted Woman Suffrage, and it is manifest that only from Representatives of the non-Suffrage States can we expect an unbiased judgment in this matter."



Catholic Woman's League

It is of great interest to see the stand taken by Catholics on the Woman Suffrage question. In forming a Catholic Woman's

League during the session of the German Catholic Central Verein, in Buffalo, the Honorary President, Mrs. Joseph Frey, is reported as saying: "While the Catholic Church has made no pronouncement on Woman Suffrage, the Catholic Philosophy of Life is opposed to it. The feminist movement is being promoted by women whose views are decidedly pagan. If their demands were realized the Christian family would cease to exist and woman's condition would lapse into paganism."

Cardinal Gibbons, in an interview in Chicago, on August 8, is also credited with saying that the Church had not passed on Woman Suffrage, but adds, "As far as I am concerned, I do not approve of it, but that is my opinion." In view of the decided stand the Catholic Church has taken in opposing Socialism, it seems natural to infer that sooner or later this powerful church will realize that Woman Suffrage is the twin sister of Socialism.



Militants Interrupt Services in St. Paul's

The Suffragettes have adopted a new plan to bring their demands before the public. At the morning service at St. Paul's Cathedral, London, August 4, when the officiating clergyman, reciting the litany, reached the passage, "Show thy pity to all prisoners and captives," about twenty Suffragettes seated below the pulpit arose and sang:

"Save Emmeline Pankhurst, spare her, give her light and set her free.

"Save her, save her, hear us while we pray to thee."

The congregation remained quiet. Vergers approached the women and urged them to withdraw. The militants protested, but went out quietly.—The Call.

Address

To the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States

By Mrs. William Forse Scott, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Guidon Club
Opposed to Woman Suffrage

THE reports of the demonstration in favor of Woman Suffrage in the Senate on Thursday, July 31st, cause peculiar surprise and anxiety, even in these times when every day brings another scream of millennium by Law.

When our highest legislative council allows a clamorous body of paraders to interrupt its deliberations, we realize that representative government has gone far toward the mob-like rule of unrestrained democracy.

The way is open to urge the question of Woman Suffrage in an orderly manner, through the representatives of the States. As the matter stands now there can be no prospect of a vote in favor of Woman Suffrage in either house. If its advocates wish to get a favorable vote, let them educate the voters of their various States to return to Congress men who favor their demand.

Have we come to the time when the methods of flattery, intimidation or reward may be brought to bear directly upon the men elected to represent the best interest of all the people?

Gentlemen of the House, we who oppose this extension of the Suffrage understand democratic government, as qualified by representation, to be a government by an orderly majority, free to express its opinions at the polls. We do not understand it to be a government under which men

elected to represent the people can properly be coerced or dragooned after their election. Picture the state of this country if, upon every difference of opinion, each party should clamorously assail the House of Congress while engaged with the legitimate affairs of state!

If one party carries a petition of 8,000 names out of a possible 4,000,000 from any one State, must the time, strength and money of all other parties be spent in gathering an equal number of names, equally unconvincing? Must the women who consider the unending traveling from end to end of the land, parading, hiking, speech-making in the streets, and all of the other exciting and demagogic methods, to be wickedly wasteful, be driven to a similar misuse of their time and strength if they would not see the men who represent them allow their rights as free citizens to be abridged because the timorous politicians are uncertain where the votes lie?

Surprise reaches the point of pain as we read the speeches made on the floor of the Senate, where men, chosen by the people to act for them, showed no respect for the organic law, which does not rest, as does statute law, upon temporary expediency, but which stands solidly upon fundamental principle.

The Senator from Utah showed such disrespect when he said that Suffrage

"Should not be given to militant radicals among our women, but only to those who follow in the womanly footsteps of Mary Ellen Foster and others." What does he mean? What principle is he applying? Who is to determine? Will the watcher at the polls ask the woman offering her ballot—"Stay! do you follow in the womanly footsteps of Mary Ellen Foster?"

Have we not reason to fear when another Senator says that "it is difficult to conceive of a valid legal objection to the right of woman to vote?" To say that when the organic law of nearly all the States expressly limits the vote to "Male citizens over twenty-one!" Statesmen of this kind appear to have no conception of the difference between organic law and statute law. To their minds the thing they want is already law.

When Mr. Poindexter shows his utter contempt for basic law in his puerile allusion to Jack Johnson, one longs to blazon his crime against the office he holds, so that never again will the voters of the State of Washington trust their welfare, and that of the country at large, to a man who makes a jest of the corner stone of democracy—that is, the power to enforce the will expressed by the ballot.

Representative government is at the bar. It has been well said by a distinguished citizen of long experience and devoted patriotism, that "on the day when the vote of Woman is established representative government will die in this country," for on that day the execution of the will of one-half of the voters must be left to the mercy of the consent of the other half—unless a dictator shall be chosen and the Army and Navy be at his command.

When we shall have trebled the num-

ber of unfit voters, when we know that a large majority of the proposed new body of voters habitually act under purely personal influences, and are bound by nature as well as by law to the performance of duties utterly inconsistent with any public life, we must dread the future of our country.



Militancy Not Purely British?

Advocates of the feminist movement who like to assure us that militancy is a purely British product and that it is generally discountenanced by the world leaders of women would do well to acquaint themselves with the proceedings at the Budapest Congress of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance. Most of the prominent American Suffragettes were present, including Mrs. Belmont and the Rev. Anna Shaw. First we have a guarded resolution protesting against the interpretation of British militancy as an argument against the Suffrage. Then we read of loud cheers at the name of Mrs. Pankhurst, and when the English non-militants tried to pass a resolution in favor of constitutional methods we find it voted down. It is evident that the denunciations of militancy are for election purposes only and that Suffragists in general are secretly applauding all that militancy implies. Perhaps we shall wake to the full significance of this when women discover that even the vote will not necessarily give them all that they want.—San Francisco Argonaut.



The Double Standard--A Parable of the Ages

By Upton Sinclair

THE following revolting "parable" published in a current Socialist magazine, and the preceding excerpt from an article by Inez Milholland, in McClure's of April, 1913, show a striking similarity in the standards of Woman Suffragist and Socialist.

"One fact that is rapidly becoming observable is that 'love' is no such definite and settled quality as our dogma and our laws vainly insist it must and shall be. It is variable, elusive, complex. Its manifestations are widely different in different individuals. It shows many evidences of fading and dying under the pressure of external force, and of flowering in conditions of greater freedom. In the case of a single individual, it often changes greatly with the changing phases of life. It is often calm and really 'enduring'; it is quite as often intense and episodic."

Once upon a time a Man married a Woman.

Time passed and one day the Man said: "I love all women. I need a great deal of love."

And the Woman replied: "I love all men. I also need a great deal of love."

Said the Man: "If you talk like that, I will hit you over the head with a club."

And the Woman said: "Forgive me, Lord and Master."

Ten thousand years passed and again the Man said: "I love all women. I need a great deal of love."

And the Woman replied: "I love all

men. I also need a great deal of love."

Said the Man: "If you talk like that, I will divorce you, and you will find it hard to earn your own living."

And the Woman said: "You are a Brute."

Another hundred years passed, and again the Man said: "I love all women. I need a great deal of love."

And the Woman replied: "I love all men. I also need a great deal of love. And, as you know, I can earn my own living."

Said the Man: "If you talk like that, I shall have to behave myself."

And the Woman said: "At last!"



Second Childhood

From the New York Times

When he was just a little kid,
He'll frankly now confess,
He would—reluctantly—obey
His learned governess.

And when a little later, he
Was sent away to school,
He went rejoicing to be free
Forever from her rule.

But now he fears his childish woes
Are coming back once more,
And that a most unhappy fate
Is yet for him in store.

So, "Down with Suffragettes!" he cries.
"Let them no more progress.
Hanged if I will again be ruled
By any Governess!"

FANNY BYRNE.

Anti-Suffrage Organizations

National Association

Opposed to Woman Suffrage

OFFICERS

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, New York.
 Mrs. Eli Whitney, Recording Secretary, New Haven
 Mrs. Robert Garrett, Treasurer, Baltimore.
 Miss Minnie Bronson, General Secretary, 37 West
 39th street, New York.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS

CONNECTICUT

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, President
 " Walter S. Schulz, Secretary, 242 North Bea-
 con street, Hartford

ILLINOIS

Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, President
 Miss J. C. Fairfield, Treasurer, 1523 Dearborn ave.,
 Chicago
 Mrs. George W. Kretzinger, Recording Secretary

IOWA

Mrs. John Flynn, President
 " Simon Casady, Secretary, 715 Prospect
 Road, Des Moines

MARYLAND

Mrs. Robert Garrett, President, Baltimore
 Miss Catherine P. Davis, Cor. Sec., Baltimore

MAINE

Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Secretary, Portland

MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. James M. Codman, President; Brookline
 Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Corresponding Secretary
 687 Boylston street, Boston

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, President
 Miss Helen E. Keep, Secretary; 753 Jefferson
 avenue, Detroit

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mrs. A. T. Dudley, President; Exeter
 Miss Grace Morrill, Cor. Secretary; Concord

NEW JERSEY

Mrs. E. Yarde Brees, President
 Miss Julia Minnegerode, Cor. Sec., Trenton

NEW YORK

Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, President
 Mrs. M. E. Loomis, Secretary, 37 West 39th st.

OHIO

Mrs. H. E. Talbot, President, Dayton

PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. Horace Brock, President
 " Brinton Coxe, Cor. Secretary; 1515 Spruce
 street, Philadelphia

RHODE ISLAND

Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, President
 " A. G. Harkness, Secretary, 7 Cooke street,
 Providence

VERMONT

Mrs. Brookes Brown, President
 " M. H. Buckham, Secretary; Burlington

VIRGINIA

Miss Jane M. Rutherford, President
 Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, Secretary; 1616 Grove
 avenue, Richmond

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. Arthur W. Dunn, President; The Brighton
 Miss C. L. Harrold, Secretary; 2101 N. street

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt, President
 Miss Genevieve Mills, Corresponding Secretary;
 222 Monona avenue, Madison

Connecticut Association

Opposed to Woman Suffrage

HARTFORD

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Pres.; 22 Sumner St.

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Miss Elizabeth R. Burnell, 35 Willard street
 Mrs. J. G. Calhoun, 201 Farmington avenue
 Mrs. W. B. Williams, 888 Asylum avenue
 Mrs. W. S. Schulz, Secretary, 242 N. Beacon st.
 Mrs. Albert S. Cook, Treasurer, 44 Sycamore Road